

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

December 1, 1998

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Jim Matteson, Phoenix, Chairman  
Victor Mendez, ADOT  
Debbie Kohn for William Bates, Avondale  
Dan Cook for Patrice Kraus, Chandler  
\*Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills  
Gary Thomas for Tami Ryall, Gilbert  
Ken Martin, Glendale  
Doug Sanders, Goodyear  
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park

Tom Buick, Maricopa County  
Jeff Martin, Mesa  
David Moody, Peoria  
\*Dick Schaner, Queen Creek  
Ken Driggs, RPTA  
Steve Hogan, Scottsdale  
Bill Parrish, Surprise  
Harvey Friedson, Tempe

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick  
McDermott, Chandler  
\*Street Committee: Ron Krosting, Mesa  
\*Pedestrian Working Group: Mike Branham,  
Surprise

\*Intermodal Management System Working  
Group: Dave Berry, Swift Transportation  
Company  
Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie  
Kohn, Avondale

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dale Buskirk, ADOT  
Chuck Eaton, ADOT  
Javier Guana, ADOT  
Bill Hayden, ADOT  
Mark Peterson, BRW  
Paul Waung, DMJM  
Diane Adams, Glendale  
Chris Thomas, Glendale  
John Halikowski, House of Representatives  
Kevin Moran, Landry & Associates

Eric Anderson, MAG  
Dawn Coomer, MAG  
John Farry, MAG  
Terry Johnson, MAG  
Sarath Joshua, MAG  
Kelly Taft, MAG  
Chris Plumb, Maricopa County DOT  
Phillip Hubbard, Peoria  
Bob Bortfeld, Phoenix  
Don Herp, Phoenix

Ken Driggs, RPTA  
Wulf Grote, RPTA  
Bryan Jungwirth, RPTA  
Victor Riches, Senate

Mary O'Connor, Tempe  
Suzanne O'Neill, TransitPlus  
Marc Caputo, Tribune  
Kathy DeBoer, WestGroup Research

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jim Matteson called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of November 3,1998

Harvey Friedson noted a typographical error in the minutes. In item 15, the phrase "was voted down unanimously be" should be changed to "was voted down unanimously by." Steve Hogan moved to approve the minutes of November 3,1998 with the change indicated. Jeff Martin seconded the motion, and the motion was approved unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience were present to address the TRC.

4. Transportation Manager's Report

Terry Johnson addressed the committee. He noted that the Management Committee would have a special meeting on Monday to address guidelines for selection of projects. He added that other items of importance on the agenda included adoption of the MAG Regional Fixed Guideway System Study and the Freeway Life Cycle Program Update.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Consent items are marked with an asterisk. Steve Hogan moved to accept the consent agenda, Jeff Martin seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

\*6. Updates of the MAG Congestion Management System

The MAG Congestion Management System (CMS) is a federal requirement that needs to be used in developing the MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The MAG CMS includes a qualitative policy element and a quantitative rating system. The quantitative rating system includes factors related to congestion, multimodal evaluation, land use considerations and cost effectiveness. The MAG CMS was adopted by the Regional Council in 1994.

In July 1998, the Regional Council directed that this system be updated. The CMS rating system is one of several considerations in selecting projects for programming, and this system is not applicable to all types of projects.

The MAG Bicycle Task Force and the MAG ITS Committee have expressed concern about the ability of the CMS to fairly rate their projects and have recommended changes. Also, concern has been expressed that congestion measures should place more emphasis on current congestion levels. The concerns have been incorporated into preliminary CMS changes discussed in the attachment. Guidelines for the selection of projects are now under development. This process could suggest additional CMS changes. With approval of the consent agenda, changes to the CMS listed in the Update Report were approved.

\*7. Red Letter Notifications

In February 1995, the Regional Council approved a Red Letter Process in which MAG member agencies notify ADOT of potential development activities in freeway alignments, including actions on plans, zoning and permits. The purpose of this process is to coordinate actions to help prevent new development from being built in the future freeway right-of-way. The last notifications received from ADOT were in April 1998. The current notifications were included as an agenda attachment.

\*8. MAG Special Transportation Needs Study: Working Paper Number Two

The TRC in cooperation with the MAG Human Services Technical Committee is providing guidance for the special Transportation Needs Study. This project will establish a basis for the region to compete for TEA-21 funding. In June 1998, the TRC reviewed Working Paper #1, Identification of Need, for the Special Transportation Needs Study. An Executive Summary of Working Paper #2 was forwarded to the committee under separate cover.

9A. Status Report on Funding Estimate for ADOT Discretionary Funds and Potential MAG Project Priorities

Eric Anderson addressed the committee. He noted that MAG and ADOT staff had been working to develop a funding estimate for ADOT discretionary funds for use in developing the 2000-2004 TIP. He added that development of this estimate was in accordance with TEA-21, and the estimate needed to be developed in a cooperative manner. He noted that the ADOT Project Priority Committee had met yesterday and developed an estimate to be presented to the State Transportation Board (STB) on Thursday. Jim Matteson asked if the STB meeting was for discussion only, and Victor Mendez replied that no action would be taken at the meeting.

Eric continued by explaining that MAG developed a preliminary program based on a working estimate of nearly \$500 million for the 2000-2004 programming period. In addition, a fair share concept was used for the 2005-2014 programming period, which resulted in an additional \$175 million annually. The preliminary program developed by MAG included acceleration of the MAG Freeway Program.

Ken Driggs noted that transit needs to be involved in discussions with ADOT and MAG that address development of funding estimates. He asked if a meeting scheduled in Yuma was still occurring, and

Eric noted that the Yuma session had been canceled since the STB study session was scheduled for the same day.

Terry Johnson continued the discussion by distributing the map enclosed in the agenda. The color map was described by Terry, who also noted that a set aside for system management and other categories was included in the program.

Ken Martin asked for clarification of how the map and table of projects included as agenda attachments fitted in with the program. Eric noted that the funding estimate including an increase in regional funding, and that the program was viable only given the estimate. Ken asked how the estimate was developed. Eric explained that two factors were considered. First, needs based criteria was applied statewide to develop the estimate of nearly \$500 million for the 2000-2004 programming period. Second, for the 2005-2014 programming period, a fair share concept was used with slight modification, resulting in an additional \$175 million annually.

Victor Mendez noted that the information provided showed a disagreement in the ADOT estimate and the MAG estimate. Eric responded that the pavement preservation funds had not yet been approved by the STB, and that MAG needed to understand the impact of different levels of investment in pavement preservation. Jeff Martin added that pavement preservation projects should be considered equally with all other projects, particularly since most preservation projects benefitted rural areas at the expense of funding for urbanized areas. Victor responded that this issue was another area of disagreement, and that the allocation for pavement preservation was based on the Pavement Management System which considered pavement condition. The allocation does not consider geographic area. Jeff added that discretionary dollars should be equally available to all areas of the state and for all types of projects.

Eric concluded by noting a concern about the allocation of additional TEA-21 funds. Originally, \$700 million was available. Now, only \$235 million was available. This concern compounds pavement preservation issues, especially concerns about the extent of openness in the process. He added that the State Highway System has excellent pavement condition when compared with other states.

Debbie Kohn asked for clarification of when the Agua Fria would be completed, and noted that part of the map (I-10 south to MC 85 at 99<sup>th</sup> Avenue) was not drawn correctly on the map. Terry responded that the map would be corrected, and Victor noted that the Agua Fria from I-10 to Northern was scheduled for completion by 2000. Debbie asked about the status of HOV lanes on I-17, and Terry noted that programmed projects are not shown on the map. Debbie then asked if concerns of Surprise and Wickenburg had been addressed, and Terry responded he was unsure of Wickenburg's position on a bypass route, and that the Grand Avenue study addressed some of these concerns. Debbie asked that efforts be made to determine these issues. The discussion concluded with Jeff congratulating MAG staff on their diligence in obtaining a regional funding estimate.

9B. Transportation Planning Focus Group Analysis

John Farry introduced Kathy DeBoer from WestGroup Research. Kathy began by noting that focus groups were held throughout the county based on the five Human Services Planning Districts. The purpose of the groups was to obtain response to the TIP and LRTP, and better understand citizen concerns about transportation funding priorities. She continued by summarizing results of the major areas discussed at the meeting, including how participants characterized the transportation system and perceptions of traffic conditions in 20 years. Kathy then showed how participants allocated funding between different transportation categories, both before and after a presentation by MAG staff. She concluded by noting conclusions of the analysis. Complete results of the focus groups are included in the *Enhanced Early Phase Input Opportunity Report*.

9C. Review of Enhanced Early Phase Public Input Opportunity on Transportation Needs

John Farry addressed the committee and provided a report on the enhanced early phase public involvement process. The process included focus groups, targeted community outreach and an open house. John provided an overview of priorities determined at the Regional Transportation Stakeholders Meeting on November 18, 1998. These priorities are documented in the *Enhanced Early Phase Input Opportunity Report*.

9D. Available Regional Transportation Funding 1999-2004

Paul Ward addressed the TRC, referring to attachment G. He noted that the regional funding available to the region was shown for three categories: Federal funding, Federal and State funding under ADOT control, and Federal transit funding. He explained that Surface Transportation Program funds have not increased substantially, but that Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds have increased approximately 38 percent over ISTEA levels. Due to this change, it may be difficult to maintain a 70 percent allocation to freeways.

Jeff Martin asked how transit fared under TEA-21. Ken Driggs responded that the formula funds average \$18 to \$20 million annually, which will help meet capital needs. Ken Martin asked if a policy change would be required to change the freeway allocation, and Paul noted that CMAQ funds cannot be spent on freeways. Ken Martin asked if these funds were required to complete the freeway program, and Steve Hogan noted that these funds are new. He added that ITS projects can use CMAQ funds, and noted that the benefit with TEA-21 can extend to road projects by using the funds for ITS.

Debbie Kohn asked how this agenda item related to the proposal to accelerate freeways, and Paul noted that the acceleration funds would come from ADOT discretionary funds. Mike Cartsonsis asked if bicycle and pedestrian projects could use CMAQ, and Paul responded that they could. Debbie asked if CMAQ funds could be used for telecommunications projects, and Paul responded affirmatively.

9E. Guidelines for Programming Regional Transportation Funds

Jim Matteson introduced the topic by requesting committee members focus on guidelines rather than the map distributed with the agenda. Terry Johnson led the discussion, which began with a discussion of regionalism as indicated on the agenda attachment. Tom Buick asked if the examples were given to illustrate or limit the definition of the concept, and Terry noted the examples were illustrative. Debbie asked why street projects on the Roads of Regional Significance were weighted higher, and Terry responded that the Congestion Management System (CMS) already gives these projects a higher weight. Jeff Martin asked if the criteria were already being used, and Terry responded that in this case they were in use.

Jeff continued by explaining that the TRC needed more time to examine these guidelines. Steve Hogan asked for the purpose of the discussion, and asked if the priorities were already in use. Terry explained that guidelines were needed on how to allocate federal funds according to Regional Council direction. He added that these guidelines would be used in addition to the CMS and any other regional policies, such as the 70 percent allocation to freeways.

Steve asked if some principles would rank higher than others, and noted that regionalism needed to be defined before principles were developed. He asked if numeric weights would be added to the guidelines, or if some projects would be included or excluded based on these criteria. Terry responded that a checklist might be used, but that numeric weights would probably not be used.

Ken Martin asked how the principles will be used to evaluate projects. He asked if completing the regional freeway system was still a high priority, and noted that it should be the most important priority. Ken Driggs added that the potential advantages for transit and travel demand management needed to be addressed. He noted that completing the freeways was important, but that an allocation for transit was needed to address critical capital needs. He added that action should be taken today since the Management Committee was meeting on Monday to specifically discuss this item.

Ken Martin noted that he had not been given sufficient time to review the guidelines and had not received them in a timely manner. He asked for additional time to review the guidelines. Jim noted that either the decision would be made by the TRC or the Managers. Steve noted that the checklist idea was good, and that the 70 percent policy is still valid. He suggested using the guidelines to eliminate some projects before they were submitted. Terry added that “regional bus system” could be changed to “regional transit system” throughout the principles and examples.

Jeff Martin added that the guidelines don’t help set priorities since they are overly general; he asked if a modal allocation was needed. Doug Sanders noted that since the Regional Council Transportation Subcommittee hadn’t met, it was difficult to consider these guidelines. Terry mentioned that the Regional Council subcommittee would be meeting on December 9. Victor Mendez added that he was concerned about these guidelines being used for all funds, especially ADOT discretionary funds. He noted that he would abstain from voting and provide written comments at a later time.

Debbie Kohn noted that item two under regionalism needed to reflect the adopted program and freeway segments approved in 1985 but not in the current program. Terry noted that the item already included this element, and the committee discussed this idea. Tom Buick noted that urban form needed to be addressed, and Steve and Mike Cartsonis agreed. Terry suggested adding an additional bullet under the regionalism principle. Jeff suggested that MAG staff work to determine appropriate language, but that this document be accepted to advance discussion. He added, however, that the document may need to change based on additional discussion. Ken Martin noted that funding issues needed to be discussed, and that there were many unknown facts in this area which limited decision-making ability. Jeff added that this guidance is very broad in scope, and that details could be worked out with further discussion.

Harvey Friedson suggested that a subcommittee meet to discuss this agenda item further, and Jim noted the group would have to meet prior to Monday. Debbie added that several mayors are out of town at a conference next week and discussion may not be able to take place within the limited time frame. Jeff noted that policy guidance was needed from elected officials, but the document should be moved along in the process. He moved that the document be accepted for purposes of moving it along in the process, but that the document be brought back for additional discussion after obtaining policy guidance from elected officials. Steve seconded the motion.

Ken Driggs noted that the issue of a modal allocation for transit needed to be considered as well. Jeff amended the motion to include examination of this issue, and Steve agreed to the amendment. David Moody asked for clarification of the action, and emphasized that more information is needed before accepting the document. Jeff clarified the motion, and Jim noted that the committee would accept but not adopt the document. Tom Buick noted that the principles should be reviewed annually and possibly rewritten every five years. Jeff amended the motion accordingly, and Steve agreed to the amendment.

Debbie voiced opposition to items four and five in the funding section. Jeff agreed that local match issues should be examined as a part of the motion. Steve added that the numbers should be removed from items four and five, and the committee noted that these changes could occur when the document was reviewed later.

The committee voted to accept the draft policy guidelines for programming regional transportation funds, with the following caveats: (1) additional input is needed from elected officials, which could change the guidelines; and (2) the TRC needed to further address the issues of a modal allocation for transit, timeline for review and revision of principles, and examination of local match issues. The motion passed with ADOT abstaining and Avondale, Glendale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Peoria and Surprise voting no. After further discussion, TRC members agreed to hold a special meeting on December 4, 1998 to address the outstanding issues.

11A. MAG Fixed Guideway System Study: Draft Report

In the interest of time, Ken Driggs requested that items 11A, 11B and 11C be taken together. He moved to accept the motions as outlined in the agenda, and Steve seconded the motion. Mary O'Connor noted that no significant changes should occur from the executive summary to the main report, and requested that minor comments be incorporated. The motion was amended accordingly. The motion includes accepting the MAG Fixed Guideway System Study and including the Central Phoenix/East Valley MIS and the Phoenix/Glendale MIS in the draft 1999 Update of the MAG Long Range Transportation Plan for an Air Quality Conformity Analysis subject to updating the transit funding plan.

The motion passed with ADOT abstaining.

11B. Central Phoenix/East Valley Major Investment Study

See discussion under 11A above.

11C. Phoenix/Glendale Major Investment Study

See discussion under 11A above.

10A. Report on MAG Freeway Program

Eric Anderson addressed the committee and noted that additional information on the funding estimate for the region was still needed. He added that projects would not be delayed and that priorities would not be disrupted. Other projects being considered included a Mesa proposal to advance the Gilbert to Higley portion of Loop 202, and the Phoenix screenwall policy.

10B. Potential Freeway Management System Projects for Inclusion in the Freeway Life Cycle Program

Sarath Joshua addressed the TRC providing an overview of the agenda attachments. The schedule for including FMS projects in the Freeway Life Cycle Program based on a deployment threshold of LOS "D" was presented. Approximately \$13.8 million is needed for basic FMS infrastructure on new freeways and \$6.3 million for retrofitting of basic infrastructure on existing freeways. Program cost to include all FMS projects that will be at LOS "D" in 2010 is \$70.31 million. The total remaining cost to implement FMS on LOS "D" freeways and the basic infrastructure is \$90.41 million. The FMS deployment based on LOS "D" criterion would result in FMS coverage reaching approximately 90 percent of the regional freeway system by 2006.

Jim Matteson asked if this infrastructure could be done with CMAQ funds, and Sarath noted that CMAQ funds could be used. Jeff Martin moved to approve the inclusion of these projects in the regional freeway program subject to available funding. In addition, if regional funding decreased,



the priorities should be reevaluated. Chris Plumb seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

10C. Review of Project to Advance Construction of the West Leg of the South Mountain/Santan/I-10 Interchange

Bill Hayden presented information on this item. He noted that there are development activities in the area, and that citizens desire to see transportation improvements in the area. He noted that the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) or a Grant Anticipation Note (GAN) could be used to fund this project. He added that a draft intergovernmental agreement and GAN application have been prepared.

Jeff Martin moved to approve the construction advance. Gary Thomas seconded the motion. Eric Anderson added that the GAN can be used on either a single project, similar to SIB, or for a group of projects. He added that doing a group of projects could be more financially prudent. The motion passed unanimously.

10D. Request to Change Number of Lanes on the Red Mountain Freeway between Gilbert Road and Power Road

Eric Anderson addressed the TRC to provide an overview of the item. He noted that the cost estimate for adding lanes between Gilbert Road and Power Road on the Red Mountain would total \$4 to \$4.5 million, or less than 5 percent of the total cost. In addition, the changes to the Santan between the Superstition and Power Road would cost approximately \$3.7 million.

Jeff Martin moved to change the Life Cycle Program to include six lanes for the Red Mountain between Gilbert Road and Power Road, and the Santan Freeway between the Superstition and Power Road. Gary Thomas seconded the motion.

David Moody asked if the change being made was based on ADT. Jeff noted that the original freeway plan had three lanes in each direction, and that the number of lanes was changed by the Governor in 1994. Ken Martin noted that Grand Avenue was also removed in 1994. Jeff responded that the list of potential projects for additional regional funds addressed Grand Avenue. Jim Matteson asked Victor Mendez what the LOS was on the segments. Victor did not know the LOS, but voiced support for adding the additional lanes. The motion passed with Avondale and Peoria abstaining.

12. Next Meeting Date

A special meeting to discuss transportation guidelines will be scheduled for Friday, December 4, 1998 at 11:30 a.m. In addition, the next regularly scheduled meeting is January 26, 1999 at 10:00 a.m. A meeting could possibly be held on January 5, 1999 at 10:00 a.m.